medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.06.21253178; this version posted April 7, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

TITLE

New Zealand Emergency Department COVID-19 Preparedness Survey

AUTHORS
Michael J. Howard MD PhD
Charlotte Chambers PhD
Nicholas M. Mohr MD MS

Author Affiliations:
1. Department of Emergency Medicine, Whangarei Hospital, Northland District health Board, Whangarei, New Zealand, michaelhowardmd@gmail.com
2. Director of Policy and Research, Association of Salaried Medical Specialists, Wellington, New Zealand, charlotte.chambers@asms.org.nz
3. Department of Emergency Medicine, University of Iowa Carver College of Medicine, Iowa City, Iowa, nicholas.mohr@iowa.edu

Corresponding Author:
Michael J. Howard MD PhD
michaelhowardmd@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Objective
This research sought to assess the level of COVID-19 preparedness of Emergency Departments (EDs) in Aotearoa New Zealand (NZ) through the views of Emergency Medicine specialists working in District Health Boards around the country. Given the limited experience NZ hospitals have had with SARS-CoV-2, a comparison of current local practice with recent literature from other countries identifying known weaknesses may help prevent future healthcare worker infections in NZ.

Methods
A cross-sectional survey by convenience sample of New Zealand Emergency Specialists in November 2020 to evaluate preparedness of engineering, administrative policy, and PPE use.

Results
A total of 137 surveys were completed (32% response rate), revealing heterogeneity in NZ ED clinical work environments in November 2020. More than 10% of emergency specialists surveyed reported no access to negative pressure rooms. N95 fit testing was not done on 15 (11%). Most specialists (86%) work in EDs that cohort patients, about one-third (34%) do not use spotters during PPE doffing, few have policy regarding breaches in PPE, and most do not have required space for physical distancing in non-clinical areas. Initial PPE training, simulations and segregating patients were widespread but appear to be waning with persistent low SARS-CoV-2 prevalence. PPE shortages were not identified in NZ EDs, yet 13% of consultants did not indicate they would use respirators during aerosol generating procedures on COVID-19 patients. Treatment interventions including non-invasive ventilation and high flow nasal cannula were common. Many respondents reported high levels of stress attributable to predicted inadequate staffing and the state of overall preparedness in event of a second wave.

Conclusions
New Zealand emergency specialists identified significant gaps in COVID-19 preparedness, and they have a unique opportunity to translate lessons from other locations into local action. Proactive identification of weaknesses in hospital engineering, policy, and PPE practice in advance of future SARS-CoV-2 endemic transmission would be prudent.

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.06.21253178; this version posted April 7, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

What is already known?
Aotearoa New Zealand has eliminated COVID-19 community transmission. Recently, trans-Tasman neighbour Australia has controlled SARS-CoV-2 surges which were complicated by significant nosocomial spread and healthcare worker infections. Several recent publications as well as expert recommendations from the Australian Department of Health and Human Services have listed improvements to the Hierarchy of Controls necessary to prevent future outbreaks in hospitals and long-term care facilities.

What are the new findings?
Survey responses specifically identified breakdowns in engineering, administrative policy and PPE in New Zealand emergency departments (EDs), potentially increasing healthcare worker nosocomial infection risk. As of November 2020, equitable access of all NZ emergency specialists to recommended negative flow rooms, fit testing of N95 masks, and other evidence based policy upgrades to COVID-19 infection prevention and control (IPC) standards are not universal.

What do the new findings imply?
The experience of local emergency specialists in a rapidly evolving pandemic can identify weaknesses in emergency preparedness previously reported to have increased nosocomial infection risk in similar healthcare environments. The aim of this research was to identify those weaknesses in local NZ emergency department policy, protocols and PPE and further efforts to provide proactive recommendations for system improvement. Finally, the research sought to understand how safe NZ emergency specialists felt during the initial lockdown and provides insight as to the psychological experiences of this vital group of front-line staff.

KEYWORDS
COVID-19, Cross-Sectional Studies, Emergency Service, Hospital, Infection Control, Infectious Disease Transmission, Patient-to-Professional

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.06.21253178; this version posted April 7, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

INTRODUCTION

The Aotearoa New Zealand (NZ) healthcare system was as unprepared for the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic as any nation, yet NZ has successfully eliminated severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2).(1, 2) Due in part to geographic isolation and a lag in cases behind other nations, by mid-March 2020 NZ assessed the preparedness of the healthcare system by applying several epidemiologic models of pandemic mortality and healthcare demand.(3, 4) These models predicted a high likelihood of healthcare system incapacity with subsequent failure to provide quality hospital-based care to COVID-19 patients and ultimately an increase in all-cause mortality due to system failure.(5, 6) The decision to implement aggressive public health infection elimination practices hinged on NZ's ability to rapidly and effectively close its borders thus limiting COVID-19 impact to approximately 2000 cases and 26 deaths.(7, 8) As a result, NZ's Emergency Departments (EDs) have had little experience caring for COVID-19 patients and disparate efforts towards infection control preparedness may leave heath care workers (HCWs) vulnerable to endemic SARS-CoV-2 transmission.(9-12)

The Hierarchy of Control offers an algorithm to assess preparedness of a health system, scalable to departmental, hospital and nationwide recommendations.(12-14) Once elimination is established but eradication remains impossible there must be appropriate resources to institute and sustain substitution of the threat (typically by vaccination or other therapies). Even as vaccine based immune protection becomes widespread there are still uncertainties requiring continuation of the hierarchy of control to prevent transmission of SARS-CoV-2. Questions about viral variants of consequence that evade host immune responses, about vaccine safety and efficacy in young children and pregnant women and the impact of vaccine hesitancy indicate we will need to maintain layers of respiratory protection for some time into the future.(15) In addition to vaccination of HCWs, pandemic ED response should continue focus on proven non-pharmaceutical interventions such as engineering (often through changes in ED physical layout, ventilation and bed allocation), administrative policy

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.06.21253178; this version posted April 7, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

(infection prevention and control, workflow changes, training, resources), and transmission-based PPE use by frontline essential HCWs. These practices demand equity, and the failure to maintain high-quality controls has resulted in healthcare worker infections, disability and death.(12, 16-18). Wellness of individuals, arguably the single most important component of the health system, must not be overlooked when considering preparedness.

The July-August 2020 outbreak in Melbourne, Victoria, Australia revealed deficiencies in hospital level infection prevention and control (IPC) in a health system comparable to that of Aotearoa New Zealand.(19, 20). Unfortunately, this outbreak in long-term care facilities and subsequent nosocomial spread in tertiary hospitals resulted in significant SARS-CoV-2 infections in HCWs. The evidence based Australian response affords insight into system preparedness improvements to adopt in other health systems.(12, 21, 22) The New Zealand Emergency Department COVID-19 (NZEDC19) Preparedness Survey of individual emergency consultants was designed from prior literature and ongoing prospective analysis to identify and address weaknesses in local NZ emergency department policy, engineering and PPE in an effort to provide proactive recommendations for system improvement.

METHODS

Questionnaire design: This study was a cross-sectional web-based assessment of COVID-19 pandemic preparedness of EDs in NZ via survey of ED Senior Medical Officers (ED SMOs) from the EDs of all NZ District Health Boards (DHBs). The study was based on a 27-item questionnaire framed around the Hierarchy of Control model with questions on Engineering (negative flow isolation rooms, shared/cohorted patient areas, segregated patient flow, physical distancing), Administrative Controls (policies for rostering, training, simulations, treatments, and breaches) and Personal Protective Equipment (supply, fit testing, use and re-use).(12, 14, 23) In addition to providing open comments at the end of each section of the survey, a final series of Likert scale questions evaluated individual

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.06.21253178; this version posted April 7, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

stress, wellness and risk assessment. The questions were adapted from both a published survey of preparedness in Intensive Care Units (ICUs) of Australasia and the ongoing prospective COVID Evaluation of Risk in Emergency Departments (COVERED) Project in the U.S.(24, 25) The questionnaire was validated using established survey methodology, after several rounds of consensus building process between ED, Microbiology and Infectious Disease specialists. The survey was distributed using Survey Monkey (San Mateo CA, USA) and self-administered between 26 October 2020 and 23 November 2020. Two e-mail reminders were sent. Participation was voluntary, with no incentives offered. The study was considered exempt from the institutional review board by the NZ Health and Disabilities Ethics Committees.(26) The data analysis was primarily descriptive and reported as percentages of valid responses. Diverging stacked Likert scale are used to display emergency specialist opinion results. The survey and raw data are included as a supplemental appendix.

Participants: The survey was distributed by email to 422 members of the Association of Salaried Medical Specialists (ASMS) who were identified in the database as having Emergency Medicine or Accident and Emergency as their designated department of work. ED Senior Medical Officers (ED SMOs) are also referred to as emergency consultants/specialists.

RESULTS

One-hundred thirty seven surveys were completed (32.5% response rate). All (100%) of 20 NZ DHBs were represented by at least 2 returned surveys. Nine (6.6%) respondents did not identify a DHB. Each DHB can be comprised of more than one ED and not all respondents chose to provide that identifying information.

Engineering: Survey results (Table 1) reveal the majority of NZ emergency consultants (120, 87.6%) have access to negative flow or negative pressure patient care rooms. Most individuals (82.5%) report 4 or less such rooms in their department with one ED having 10 or more negative flow beds. Of ED consultants who responded, 17 (12.4 %) report no access to negative flow rooms for COVID-19

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.06.21253178; this version posted April 7, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

patient care. Most respondents (100, 74.1%) reported caring for patients cohorted into multiple bed areas, separated only by curtains with shared air circulation. ED consultants from 4 smaller hospitals report having no cohorted patient beds.

Nearly all (126, 92%) of surveyed emergency consultants work in EDs which can create physical separation of care areas for High (HIS) Index of Suspicion patients segregated from those for presumed Low Index of Suspicion (LIS) patients. Several emergency consultants from multiple DHBs commented that ED segregated flow or “streaming” can be changed with COVID-19 prevalence and alert level (open comments).

The majority of respondents did not feel they could meet minimum physical distancing requirements for patient care in their workplace and disagree or strongly disagree it is possible at offices (94, 68.6%) workstations (118, 86.1%), break rooms (92, 67.1%)(Figure 1).

Administrative controls: Rostering ED consultants into either strictly “COVID” or “non-COVID” teams is not common and the majority (82, 64.1%) see either patient population.

Almost all (97.1%) of NZ ED consultants report having training for proper transmission based PPE use with 66% having had in-person sessions involving being observed donning and doffing by the instructor. In practice, NZ emergency specialists report donning observation is rarely (18%) mandatory and about a third (30.2%) do not have an observer present. Only 16% report mandatory observation during removal while a third (34.1%) are not usually observed doffing PPE. Greater than half the NZ emergency consultant workforce surveyed are not aware of official breach of PPE policy in their hospital ED or breach criteria.(27) Although they report access to showers, approximately 75% of NZ ED SMOs report no policy for showering after breach, after shifts, or at home.

Simulation training is common in NZ for donning, doffing and COVID-19 patient intubation. Less common simulations are performed for non-invasive ventilation and are rare for self-proning or transport of COVID-19 patients.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.06.21253178; this version posted April 7, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Rapidly evolving treatment protocols specific for COVID-19 hypoxia from high prevalence countries have identified high-flow nasal cannula (HFNC) and non-invasive ventilation (NIV) techniques (continuous (CPAP) and bilevel (BiPAP) positive pressure ventilation) as promising to avoid intubation, decrease potential ventilator associate lung injury and minimize the risk of AGPs.(28, 29) Greater than half (65, 54.2%) of specialists report HFNC available with widespread adoption possibly due to domestic manufacturer. About 14% do not have protocols for, or do not use, HFNC. Roughly half of ED specialists say they can utilize NIV (CPAP/BiPAP) (55%) but only 16% report using viral expiration filters, a low cost recommended infection control adaptation. NIV is not used outside negative pressure rooms and only 4% report need to transfer to ICU for this modality. NIV is not used by 15%, and 9% report having no formal protocol. The majority of specialists report wide discretion in their ability to apply NIV to COVID-19 patients and just 15% reserve it only for patients with comorbidities (COPD, CHF, etc.) known to benefit.

If intubation is required only a third of consultants report having designated intubation teams, about three quarters (71.5%) would use video laryngoscopy, 15% a supraglottic device and 10-15% report using “intubation boxes” despite literature reporting potential increased exposures to SARS-CoV-2.(30) Only two thirds of consultants (64%) would intubate HIS/COVID-19 patients in a negative pressure room, and very few (4%) would intubate LIS/non-COVID-19 patients under negative pressure.

As care for severe/critical COVID-19 patients is highly dependent on skilled staff, the lack of adequate staffing levels during the pandemic is cited as the highest concern for two thirds of NZ ED SMOs (Figure 2). Having adequate PPE and available testing were not considered of equal concern if a future wave of COVID-19 occurred in NZ (Figure 2).

Personal protective equipment: New Zealand emergency consultants report few shortages of consumable PPE and have had little experience with reusing PPE except for washable face shields and goggles (Table 1). Low reuse of N95 masks either without sterilization (9%) and after sterilization

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.06.21253178; this version posted April 7, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

(2%) further supports existence of adequate supply of PPE for the low prevalence of COVID-19 experienced to date in NZ. Respondents report lack of supply for elastomeric respirators and powered air-purifying respirators (PAPRs).(31, 32) Correlation to larger DHBs or those with prior experience with COVID-19 did not appear significant due to low numbers reporting.

About one in ten ED consultants (11%) had not been fit tested for N95 masks at the time of this survey. Half of these (7/15) were from hospitals in the Waikato DHB, 2 were from Tairawhiti, 1 each from Hutt Valley, Northland, Southern (Dunedin and Southland), West Coast and Whanganui. The majority of fit testing was performed by a qualitative test (odour or taste detection in hood).

Best practice for ED consultant use of transmission based PPE was assessed in different clinical scenarios as shown in (Table 2). Only 83% of respondents report using N95 respirators in context of an aerosol generating procedure (AGP) with an additional 4% protected with elastomeric or PAPR. To clarify, roughly 13% of NZ ED SMOs would not choose a respirator (N95 mask, elastomeric mask or PAPR) when in close proximity to a HIS/COVID-19 patient receiving an AGP. Five consultants (4%) report using only a surgical mask during AGPs for HIS/COVID-19 patients.

There is variable PPE practice reported when caring for either a High or Low Index of Suspicion patient while not performing an AGP. For a HIS/COVID-19 patient without an AGP consultants report N95 use of 48%, the rest using surgical mask alone or over N95. When seeing a LIS patient and no AGP, 6% report using an N95 respirator. Two thirds (69%) wear some type of mask seeing LIS patients and one third of emergency consultants surveyed see LIS patients in their ED without a mask. While working outside of direct patient care but still in the hospital one third of ED SMOs wear a surgical or reusable fabric mask. Toilets may present a unique risk for droplet and possibly faecal-airborne transmission yet only 10% report using masks in toilets.(33, 34)

Wellness, Perception and Risk Assessment: In ED consultant self-reported recall of feelings during the initial Level 4 lockdown in March through May 2020, 78% felt anxious and stressed. Approximately 72% of respondents were sometimes to always concerned about ED preparedness,

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.06.21253178; this version posted April 7, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

personal risk of infection (62%), and of infecting family or close contacts (55%)(Figure 3). Inadequate staffing (65%) and ED preparedness (46%) are cited as concerns in future waves while PPE supply and available testing are less so (Figure 2). A majority (64%) of respondents agree they are at increased risk of COVID-19 infection. A summary rank-ordered list by ED consultants' assessment of their most likely source of exposure to COVID-19 being "wearing inadequate PPE for patients not suspected of COVID-19 infection", was followed by "contracting it from fellow staff members" or "accidental doffing exposure" as the top three most likely routes of nosocomial infection. Consultants were less concerned about inadequate N95 mask fit testing or the lack of appropriate training or PPE for co-workers such as housekeeping staff (Table 3).

DISCUSSION

This study assesses the preparedness of EDs around Aotearoa New Zealand for the eventual reintroduction of SARS-CoV-2 either through sporadic community spread or the reopening of NZs borders contingent on vaccine based herd immunity. As vaccination roll out accelerates, NZ will be monitoring uncertainties such as vaccine uptake, efficacy against variants, prevention of transmission, and vaccine safety in populations such as children and pregnant women.(15, 35) We hypothesize that the experience of individual Emergency Medicine specialists could be surveyed to identify weaknesses in local NZ hospital infection control practice. This questionnaire focuses on retrospective and prospective assessments by EM specialists of their departmental practice for pandemic specific engineering (ventilation, cohorting, streaming, physical distancing), administrative policy (rostering, workflow, training, treatments and procedures), and the use and supply of PPE (scenario specific, transmission based PPE, and fit testing).(13) Questions were translated from prior healthcare worker infection outbreaks, most notably from the Royal Melbourne Hospital campus during July-August 2020.(9, 12, 17) Finally, the research sought to understand how safe EM specialists felt during the initial lockdown and provides insight as to the psychological experiences of this vital group of frontline staff.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.06.21253178; this version posted April 7, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Engineering controls decrease SARS-CoV-2 transmission by modifications to ventilation, bed allocation, streaming patients and physical distancing of staff. A minimum requirement would provide enough adequately ventilated and sealed negative pressure rooms, or at least negative directional airflow, to allow for treatment of respiratory isolation patients requiring AGPs. Negative flow dilutes contaminated air breathed by HCWs caring for patients with airborne transmissible infections. DHBs must prioritise areas with a greater number of air changes per hour (ideally 6-12 ACH), and greater proportion of fresh (vs recycled) air or consider portable HEPA filter units if airflow is inadequate.(11, 22) The finding that 12.4% of consultants report no access to at least one negative flow room for AGPs, mostly in smaller peripheral hospitals, suggests NZ DHBs have not equitably upgraded all EDs.

Recent changes in Australian policy require that COVID-19 patients are housed in separate ED areas or wards away from others where possible.(12, 22, 36) In this model, HCWs are to be rostered such that they minimize intermingling between COVID and Non-COVID teams. A majority (126, 92%), but not all of NZ consultants work in EDs that stream HIS/COVID-19 patients but most (64%) report being rostered to alternate seeing both HIS and LIS patients.

In Melbourne, HCWs caring for multiple patients cohorted together in larger multi-bed rooms were deemed at higher risk of nosocomial infection. Roughly 80% of NZ specialists report having ED patients cohorted with only curtains separating beds and shared air circulation. Only four smaller NZ hospital EDs report no multiple bed bays. Based on overseas experience, large numbers of COVID-19 patients in confined spaces may create a high density of aerosols and environmental contamination and cause HCWs to stay longer as they attend to each patient increasing their risk. Best practice reduces patient density to one per room (even if in a 2 or 4 bed bay) and mandates airborne PPE for staff in these situations.(12, 37, 38) Conversely, use of multi-bed bays with shared ventilation to cohort presumed Non-COVID patients risks misidentifying the asymptomatic or

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.06.21253178; this version posted April 7, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

presymptomatic patients as safe to collocate with other uninfected individuals. Well ventilated or HEPA filtered areas may decrease this risk but evidence is limited.

Despite recommendations to maintain physical distancing in non-clinical work areas most (86%) of NZ specialists disagreed that their ED workstations allowed adequate room (Figure 1). This illustrates the inter-relationship of some controls in that the lack of resources, physical space or personnel can undo administrative efforts to protect staff and patients from exposures.

Administrative policy involves institution of rules that change how health care workers behave. Workflow changes in Australian hospitals intend to minimise staff crowding and face to face contact between staff during breaks.(39) Aside from physical distancing in all areas these policies encourage mask use during breaks (when not physically eating) during periods of heightened risk. There is some uptake of this in NZ as about a third of ED specialists report using surgical masks in non-clinical areas (Table 2) even as the risk has been low. Updated recommendations promote additional areas for breaks (including outdoors) and QR code log entry to common areas to facilitate contact tracing. These changes support staggering breaks, breaks < 15 minutes, minimise intermingling between "COVID and Non-COVID teams" during breaks and audit compliance with these measures. Australian hospitals now try to minimise the number of staff that work across segregated EDs and in different wards. They also split teams into a "silo workforce" to provide redundancy. In contrast, NZ ED consultants (60%) are commonly rostered to see both LIS and HIS/COVID-19 patients with larger facilities able to flex and alter this practice with alert level/prevalence changes (open comments).

In order to halt the outbreak, attempts were made to improve nurse to patient ratios but because of large numbers of staff furloughs, the remaining staff experienced high workloads.(12, 36, 39) NZ must ensure manageable workload through adequate staffing ratios by anticipating the increased care required for these infectious respiratory failure patients. This may also prevent the added fatigue HCWs face secondary to PPE compliance, doffing observation, and decontamination of providers and work environment. These additional tasks may not be calculated into traditional bedside severity

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.06.21253178; this version posted April 7, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

scores and underestimate nursing ratios. Among the strongest recommendations in the literature regarding prevention of HCW nosocomial infection is to “decant” or decrease overcrowding of COVID-19 patients in EDs and wards.(12)

Maintaining a healthy skilled workforce is paramount to offset predicted inadequate staffing. Establishing an updated system wide policy to standardize “breach” definitions and best practice to limit HCW exposures is needed in NZ as this survey implies. This will need to be updated as vaccination and variants of concern evolve.(35) Additional Australian IPC changes support surveillance testing of asymptomatic staff in high-risk areas during periods of community transmission and have a plan for hospital outbreak management and testing of staff.(40) A proactive approach should be used to support infected and furloughed staff wellbeing, with dedicated nursing and medical staff monitoring physical and mental health as well as providing practical supports.

Policy endorsing treatment protocols specific for COVID-19 hypoxia have identified high-flow nasal cannula (HFNC) and non-invasive ventilation (NIV) techniques (continuous (CPAP) and bilevel (BiPAP) positive pressure ventilation) as well as self-proning to avoid intubation, decrease potential ventilator associate lung injury and minimize the risk of AGPs.(28, 29) This study and a prior survey of intensivists show the use of HFNC and NIV in this pandemic has relatively high penetrance in NZ.(24) Only two thirds of NZ ED specialists (64%) would intubate HIS/COVID-19 patients in a negative pressure/flow room. Allowing for the roughly 12% who reported no access to this engineering control, it suggests up to 1/4 NZ ED consultants depart from recommended practice. It is possible the difference represents consultants who do not intubate and or intend to transfer care before that indication arises. Early concern due to AGP risk and limitation by availability of adequately ventilated ED rooms saw the development of other unvalidated barrier devices such as intubation boxes.(41) Evidence and policy have lagged behind utilisation as has been the case globally in the pandemic. The highest risk procedures like intubations have been often relegated to proficient and experienced intubation teams and nosocomial infections from intubations appear to be controlled.(42)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.06.21253178; this version posted April 7, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

This expertise may not be available in smaller institutions. Prospective studies on the evaluation of COVID-19 risk in emergency departments are ongoing.(25)

Initial training for PPE use was universal (97%) but ongoing interval training was not common nor was mandatory observation during donning or doffing as recommended in the literature.(20) Training (baseline and refreshers) and monitoring policy for PPE use (spotters) for all clinical and non-clinical staff should be standardized across DHBs. Simulations to practice skills (such as intubation and NIV use) and accommodate for PPE have been applied in NZ(20). Various scenarios as simulation sessions should be extended to more members of the health team who may be at risk including transport, security, and housekeeping/cleaning services to ensure equitable preparedness of all members of the team. Once confident in the controls protecting the SMO there may be a lack of initiative to ensure equitable protection for other groups within one's own department. This inequity can extend throughout the system, where HCWs doing the same job in peripheral hospitals may not enjoy the same level of protection.

Personal Protective Equipment places a barrier between the HCW and the infectious agent (the principal example being respirators and other masks) and are considered the final and least effective control measure, as they depend on proper use by an individual every time they are worn.(14) PPE should be implemented through clear guidelines and be current with peer reviewed literature and expert recommendations.(24, 43-45) The NZ Ministry of Health (MoH) last updated PPE recommendations 22 September 2020 and these do not promote use of N95 respirators outside of AGPs for HIS/COVID-19 patients. Factors such as observed vaccination efficacy and uptake, need for boosters and the prevalence of variants of consequence will need to be monitored and may affect PPE recommendations

This study shows that shortages of N95 masks, and one key reason for limiting their use, have largely resolved and improved supplies allow hospitals to stop contingency and crisis practices (e.g. decontaminating N95s and using surgical masks in place of respiratory protection). The NZ MoH

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.06.21253178; this version posted April 7, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

should acknowledge literature demonstrating that transmission through inhalation of small airborne particles is a significant mode of SARS-CoV-2 virus transmission.(45-48) These studies demonstrate aerosols produced through breathing, talking, coughing and yelling can remain in air and viable for long periods of time, travel long distances within a room and sometimes farther depending on ventilation. The experience in The Royal Melbourne Hospital City Campus outbreak noted that "aerosol generating behaviour" (AGB) in infected patients appeared to be linked to transmission events(12). Patients shouting, vigorous coughing, cognitive impairment and combative behaviour, actions common in ED patients, should mandate airborne precautions.(39) This policy is consistent with the science.(45)

Fit testing of N95 respirators in line with other national health and safety legislation was late to be initiated, and for at least 15 consultants (11%) was still not available at the time of this survey.(20, 24) Small peripheral facilities, as was the case for negative flow rooms, appear to be less prepared. Several individuals made open comments about the lack of styles and sizes of P2/N95 respirators to increase likelihood of an appropriate fit for all relevant staff.

Planning for surges in demand for PPE when risk of community transmission increases must be done in advance and be transparent. Planning for anticipated changes in PPE recommendations in the event of increased community transmission is needed and proactive NZ MoH guidance will be required.(44)

In the scenario-based PPE questions, the finding that up to 13% of NZ ED consultants would not choose an N95 respirator, elastomeric or PAPR in the context of an aerosol generating procedure (AGP) for a HIS/COVID-19 patient was unexpected and raises concern. Given the low prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 in NZ, the probability of an HIS patient being infected is low, but not zero. Some ED consultants may argue N95s are not necessary due to elimination efforts or may believe they are still in short supply. But the omission of this recommended PPE could be interpreted as a purposeful disregard of evidence based pandemic IPC practice or a deliberate ignorance of why these policies exist. In a pandemic, an individual's choice to forgo personal protection does not just take the risk for

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.06.21253178; this version posted April 7, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

themselves, but for the community of others on their health care team, the other patients they care for, and their families and close contacts. Instituting and maintaining a standardized observer system and breach protocols should remedy this issue and may help promote a culture of staff safety, risk and adverse event reporting and staff support. NZ has enjoyed near SARS-CoV-2-free medical practice environment but sporadic reintroduction has occurred with HCW infection and risking transmission during aerosol generating procedures is an unconscionable breach of infection prevention and control.(18) This will have to change.

Some professional organizations have gone one step further and simplified the practice. The Australasian and New Zealand College of Anaesthesia in conjunction with Infection Control Expert Group (ICEG) recently recommend wearing airborne precaution PPE for care of all patients with high risk of SARS-CoV-2, irrespective of the community transmission.(43) The NZ Ministry of Health, as well as other professional organizations such as the Australasian College of Emergency Medicine, should update their IPC recommendations in advance of political and economic pressure to forgo elimination for mitigation as NZ attains vaccine based herd immunity.

Proactive support of staff wellbeing through employee assistance programs and counselling is a priority in the new Australian paradigm and should be in the NZ system as well. Levels of stress reported by NZ ED SMOs to a lesser degree mirrors those reported in the literature.(49) In recall of frequency of feeling worried they rated ED Preparedness as their highest concern. This followed by worry over their personal risk and that to their family or others due to their work (Figure 3).

Through rank listing of perceived risks, ED SMOs demonstrate a nuanced understanding of the complexity of transmission in their work setting (Table 3). Reassured that appropriate use of aerosol PPE for high risk patients will protect them, ED specialists identify use of less protection around patients who may be asymptomatic or around colleagues as being their most likely source for potential transmission at their work(50). Relative risks are difficult to quantify, yet the risk of transmission from an infected co-worker, nurses and other doctors, has been cited as a factor in prior

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.06.21253178; this version posted April 7, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

outbreaks.(51-53) In several studies, ancillary staff such as housekeepers were recognized as having the highest rates of undiagnosed infection.(12, 42) The epidemiology of frontline worker infection imply social determinants of health play a significant role further supporting that the equitable protection of all members of the a healthcare team is crucial to successful infection control in a pandemic.(42, 53)

CONCLUSION

This study of NZ ED specialists points to several areas of preparedness that need improvement. The NZ MoH needs to update guidelines to be consistent with the literature and recognize SARS-CoV-2 transmission via inhalation exposure to small inhalable airborne particles. Accordingly, adequate well ventilated negative flow rooms to care for COVID-19 patients requiring AGPs must be available and equitably distributed. Cohorting either LIS or HIS patients during community spread should be avoided. Yearly fit testing of N95 masks, or adequate substitutes such as elastomeric respirators or PAPRs, must be available to all ED specialists and their extended healthcare teams. Updated PPE use policy should include mandatory observers to prevent breaches and audit use. Vaccination of HCWs will decrease clinical infections and hopefully interrupt transmission but nosocomial infections from vaccine breakthrough or among unvaccinated patients remains a concern.(35) Despite a year of the pandemic, these survey results point to a persistent lack of consensus in IPC policy and inequitable distribution of means of controlling infection at the local level. Certainly, the low prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 has allowed the practice and controls crucial in this pandemic elsewhere to go untested and sometimes even ignored without consequence in NZ. While there has been plenty to celebrate in NZs successful elimination of SARS-CoV-2, the experience of our Australian neighbours predicts holes in our own engineering, administration policy and PPE that could still be the undoing of the efforts of “the team of 5 million.”

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.06.21253178; this version posted April 7, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

LIMITATIONS

The choice to directly survey individual ED consultants was deliberate and allowed discrete assessment of wellness of the workforce, the diversity of opinions and differential experience even within the same DHB. However, rates of response differed from each DHB such that their experience may bias those of DHBs with lower participation or smaller workforce. Multivariate analysis of answers relative to DHB size, census, experience with COVID-19 patients was attempted to avoid potential dilution of answers from smaller EDs. There may be reporting bias by non-random participant selection and excluding other HCWs. Some questions depend on recall of feelings during initial lockdown, introducing recall bias. Much of the vocabulary and policy of the pandemic is new to emergency consultants and may have caused confusion. Effort was made to ensure we used complete and current email addresses for all currently employed NZ ED consultants.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank our many colleagues who have contributed to development of the NZEDC19 Preparedness Survey. In particular Drs. Arvind Rajamani, Ashwin Subramaniam, Jason Barton, Eugene Fayerberg, David Hammer, Elspeth Frascatore. Dr. Charlotte Chambers is employed as a research scientist with ASMS. ASMS administration did not have any role in the planning, writing or publication of the work or the decision to publish. We have no relevant disclosures or competing interests.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.06.21253178; this version posted April 7, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

REFERENCES

1. Baker MG, Wilson N, Anglemyer A. Successful Elimination of Covid-19 Transmission in New Zealand. N Engl J Med. 2020;383(8):e56.
2. Boyd M, Baker MG, Nelson C, Wilson N. The 2019 Global Health Security Index (GHSI) and its implications for New Zealand and Pacific regional health security. N Z Med J. 2020;133(1516):83-92.
3. Ferguson N, Laydon D, Nedjati Gilani G, Imai N, Ainslie K, Baguelin M, et al. Impact of non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs) to reduce COVID-19 mortality and healthcare demand. Imperial College London. 2020.
4. Kucharski AJ, Russell TW, Diamond C, Liu Y, Edmunds J, Funk S, et al. Early dynamics of transmission and control of COVID-19: a mathematical modelling study. Lancet Infect Dis. 2020;20(5):553-8.
5. Baker MG, Kvalsvig A, Verrall AJ. New Zealand's COVID-19 elimination strategy. Med J Aust. 2020;213(5):198-200.e1.
6. Jefferies S, French N, Gilkison C, Graham G, Hope V, Marshall J, et al. COVID-19 in New Zealand and the impact of the national response: a descriptive epidemiological study. Lancet Public Health. 2020;5(11):e612-e23.
7. Baker M, Kvalsvig A, Verrall AJ, Telfar-Barnard L, Wilson N. New Zealand's elimination strategy for the COVID-19 pandemic and what is required to make it work. N Z Med J. 2020;133(1512):10-4.
8. Robert A. Lessons from New Zealand's COVID-19 outbreak response. Lancet Public Health. 2020;5(11):e569-e70.
9. Chou R, Dana T, Buckley DI, Selph S, Fu R, Totten AM. Epidemiology of and Risk Factors for Coronavirus Infection in Health Care Workers: A Living Rapid Review. Ann Intern Med. 2020;173(2):120-36.
10. Bandyopadhyay S, Baticulon RE, Kadhum M, Alser M, Ojuka DK, Badereddin Y, et al. Infection and mortality of healthcare workers worldwide from COVID-19: a systematic review. BMJ Glob Health. 2020;5(12).
11. Cheng VCC, Wong S-C, Chuang VWM, So SYC, Chen JHK, Sridhar S, et al. Absence of nosocomial transmission of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) due to SARS-CoV-2 in the prepandemic phase in Hong Kong. American Journal of Infection Control. 2020;48(8):890-6.
12. Buising KL, Williamson D, Cowie BC, MacLachlan J, Orr E, MacIsaac C, et al. A hospital-wide response to multiple outbreaks of COVID-19 in health care workers: lessons learned from the field. Med J Aust. 2020.
13. Hierarchy of Controls: Centers for Disease Control; 2020 [cited 2020. Available from: https://www.cdc.gov/niosh/topics/hierarchy/default.html.
14. Rabeea F. Khan M, John D. Meyer, MD, MPH,. How Does the Hierarchy of Controls Integrate With the Epidemiologic Triangle to Help Address and Understand Transmission of SARS-CoV-2? Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine. 2020;62(11):e665-e8.
15. Thompson MG, Burgess JL, Naleway AL, Tyner HL, Yoon SK, Meece J, et al. Interim Estimates of Vaccine Effectiveness of BNT162b2 and mRNA-1273 COVID-19 Vaccines in Preventing SARS-CoV-2 Infection Among Health Care Personnel, First Responders, and Other Essential and Frontline Workers - Eight U.S. Locations, December 2020-March 2021. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep. 2021;70(13):495-500.
16. Fenton E. Management of personal protective equipment in New Zealand during the COVID-19 pandemic: report from the Auditor-General. N Z Med J. 2020;133(1522):144-8.
17. Nguyen LH, Drew DA, Graham MS, Joshi AD, Guo C-G, Ma W, et al. Risk of COVID-19 among front-line health-care workers and the general community: a prospective cohort study. The Lancet Public Health. 2020;5(9):e475-e83.
18. COVID-19 in Health Care and Support Workers in Aotearoa New Zealand Wellington: New Zealand Ministry of Health; 2020 [Available from: https://www.health.govt.nz/publication/covid-19-health-care-and-support-workers-aotearoa-new-zealand.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.06.21253178; this version posted April 7, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

19. Varghese C, Xu W. Quantifying what could have been - The impact of the Australian and New Zealand governments' response to COVID-19. Infect Dis Health. 2020;25(4):242-4.
20. Barratt R, Shaban RZ, Gilbert GL. Characteristics of personal protective equipment training programs in Australia and New Zealand hospitals: A survey. Infect Dis Health. 2020;25(4):253-61.
21. Healthcare Worker Infection Prevention and Wellbeing Taskforce Internet: Australian Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS); 2020 [Available from: https://www.dhhs.vic.gov.au/healthcare-worker-infection-prevention-and-wellbeing-taskforce.
22. Hierarchy of controls for prevention of COVID-19 transmission in hospitals Internet: Queensland Australia Statewide Infection Clinical Network; 2020 [updated 23.10.2020 Available from: https://www.health.qld.gov.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0021/1012683/hierarchy-of-controls-prevention-covid-19.pdf.
23. Hierarchy of Controls Workplace Safety & Health Topics Web site: National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health; 2015 [Available from: https://www.cdc.gov/niosh/topics/hierarchy/default.html.
24. Rajamani A, Subramaniam A, Shekar K, Haji J, Luo J, Bihari S, et al. Personal protective equipment preparedness in Asia-Pacific intensive care units during the coronavirus disease 2019 pandemic: A multinational survey. Aust Crit Care. 2020:S1036-7314(20)30306-4.
25. Mohr N, Talan D, Krishnadasan A, Harland K, Wallace K, Willey J. COVID-19 Evaluation of Risk in Emergency Departments (Project COVERED). 2020; https://smex12-5-en-ctp.trendmicro.com:443/wis/clicktime/v1/query?url=https%3a%2f%2fdr2.nlm.nih.gov%2fsearch%2f%3fq%3d22586&umid=f5c639df-4a4f-485c-b828-4374e602ceb8&auth=33daf4ba0a26549707f81ea1cfa75d4b0b8ff8df-c8346cf7f3bfe0dacf4c186db98b8f894c4b4ae1. Accessed June 15, 2020 2020 [
26. Kelley K, Clark B, Brown V, Sitzia J. Good practice in the conduct and reporting of survey research. International Journal for Quality in Health Care. 2003;15(3):261-6.
27. Avo C, Cawthorne KR, Walters J, Healy B. An observational study to identify types of personal protective equipment breaches on inpatient wards. Journal of Hospital Infection. 2020;106(1):208-10.
28. Gattinoni L, Chiumello D, Caironi P, Busana M, Romitti F, Brazzi L, et al. COVID-19 pneumonia: different respiratory treatments for different phenotypes? Intensive Care Medicine. 2020;46(6):1099-102.
29. Wei H, Jiang B, Behringer EC, Hofmeyr R, Myatra SN, Wong DT, et al. Controversies in airway management of COVID-19 patients: updated information and international expert consensus recommendations. Br J Anaesth. 2021;126(2):361-6.
30. Lim ZJ, Ponnapa Reddy M, Karalapillai D, Shekar K, Subramaniam A. Impact of an aerosol box on time to tracheal intubation: systematic review and meta-analysis. British Journal of Anaesthesia. 2021;126(3):e122-e5.
31. Licina A, Silvers A. Use of powered air-purifying respirator(PAPR) as part of protective equipment against SARS-CoV-2-a narrative review and critical appraisal of evidence. American journal of infection control. 2020:S0196-6553(20)30992-5.
32. Chiang J, Hanna A, Lebowitz D, Ganti L. Elastomeric respirators are safer and more sustainable alternatives to disposable N95 masks during the coronavirus outbreak. Int J Emerg Med. 2020;13(1):39.
33. Ding Z, Qian H, Xu B, Huang Y, Miao T, Yen H-L, et al. Toilets dominate environmental detection of SARS-CoV-2 virus in a hospital. medRxiv. 2020:2020.04.03.20052175.
34. Kang M, Wei J, Yuan J, Guo J, Zhang Y, Hang J, et al. Probable Evidence of Fecal Aerosol Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in a High-Rise Building. Ann Intern Med. 2020;173(12):974-80.
35. Daniel W, Nivet M, Warner J, Podolsky DK. Early Evidence of the Effect of SARS-CoV-2 Vaccine at One Medical Center. New England Journal of Medicine. 2021.
36. Protecting our healthcare workers: State of Victoria, Australia, Department of Health and Human Services; 20210 [Available from: https://www.dhhs.vic.gov.au/sites/default/files/documents/202008/2001628_COVID-19%20Protecting%20our%20healthcare%20workers_v9.pdf.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.06.21253178; this version posted April 7, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

37. Klompas M, Baker MA, Rhee C. Airborne Transmission of SARS-CoV-2: Theoretical Considerations and Available Evidence. JAMA. 2020;324(5):441-2.
38. Liu Y, Ning Z, Chen Y, Guo M, Liu Y, Gali NK, et al. Aerodynamic analysis of SARS-CoV-2 in two Wuhan hospitals. Nature. 2020;582(7813):557-60.
39. Victorian Respiratory Protection Program guidelines September 2020 (Version 1.1) [PDF]. Internet: Healthcare Worker Infection Prevention and Wellbeing Taskforce; 2020 [updated September 2020; cited 2021. Version 1.1:[Available from: https://www.dhhs.vic.gov.au/protecting-our-healthcare-workers-victoria%E2%80%99s-respiratory-protection-program-COVID-19-pdf.
40. Bielicki JA, Duval X, Gobat N, Goossens H, Koopmans M, Tacconelli E, et al. Monitoring approaches for health-care workers during the COVID-19 pandemic. Lancet Infect Dis. 2020;20(10):e261-e7.
41. Turer DM, Good CH, Schilling BK, Turer RW, Karlowsky NR, Dvoracek LA, et al. Improved Testing and Design of Intubation Boxes During the COVID-19 Pandemic. Ann Emerg Med. 2021;77(1):1-10.
42. Shields A, Faustini SE, Perez-Toledo M, Jossi S, Aldera E, Allen JD, et al. SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence and asymptomatic viral carriage in healthcare workers: a cross-sectional study. Thorax. 2020;75(12):1089-94.
43. ANZCA statement on personal protection equipment (PPE) during the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic; Version 4 (October 2020) 2020 [Available from: https://www.anzca.edu.au/resources/professional-documents/statements/anzca-covid-ppe-statement
44. New Zealand Ministry of Health – Manatu Hauora. Personal protective equipment use in health and disability care settings. 2020 [updated 2020 Sep 25; cited 2020 3 March 2021]. Available from: https://www.health.govt.nz/our-work/diseases-and-conditions/covid-19-novel-coronavirus/covid-19-information-specific-audiences/covid-19-personal-protective-equipment-workers/personal-protective-equipment-use-health-and-disability-care-settings.
45. Klompas M, Baker MA, Griesbach D, Tucker R, Gallagher GR, Lang AS, et al. Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 from asymptomatic and presymptomatic individuals in healthcare settings despite medical masks and eye protection. Clinical Infectious Diseases. 2021.
46. Goldberg L, Levinsky Y, marcus N, Hoffer V, Gafner M, Hadas S, et al. SARS-CoV-2 infection among healthcare workers despite the use of surgical masks and physical distancing - the role of airborne transmission. Open Forum Infectious Diseases. 2021.
47. Karlsson U, Fraenkel C-J. Covid-19: risks to healthcare workers and their families. BMJ. 2020;371:m3944.
48. Coronavirus is in the air - there's too much focus on surfaces. Nature. 2021;590(7844):7.
49. Marco CA, Larkin GL, Feeser VR, Monti JE, Vearrier L. Post-traumatic stress and stress disorders during the COVID-19 pandemic: Survey of emergency physicians. J Am Coll Emerg Physicians Open. 2020;1(6):1594-601.
50. Jacob JT, Baker JM, Fridkin SK, Lopman BA, Steinberg JP, Christenson RH, et al. Risk Factors Associated With SARS-CoV-2 Seropositivity Among US Health Care Personnel. JAMA Network Open. 2021;4(3):e211283-e.
51. Muhi S, Irving LB, Buising KL. COVID-19 in Australian health care workers: early experience of the Royal Melbourne Hospital emphasises the importance of community acquisition. Med J Aust. 2020;213(1):44-.e1.
52. Smith P. Covid-19 in Australia: most infected health workers in Victoria's second wave acquired virus at work. BMJ. 2020;370:m3350.
53. Self WH, Tenforde MW, Stubblefield WB, Feldstein LR, Steingrub JS, Shapiro NI, et al. Seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2 Among Frontline Health Care Personnel in a Multistate Hospital Network - 13 Academic Medical Centers, April-June 2020. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep. 2020;69(35):1221-6.

(which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuit
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Table 1: Summary table of select NZEDC19 Preparedness survey answers

Catergory	Specific Infection Control Question	N	%
Engineering	Negative Flow/Pressure Rooms in ED	120	87.6%
	Cohorted Beds in ED	100	74.1%
	Segregated COVID/Non-COVID patients in ED	126	92.0%
	Rostered to see both COVID/Non-COVID as needed	82	64.1%
	Unable to Meet Physical Distance Requirements at Office	94	68.6%
	Unable to Meet Physical Distance Requirements at Workstation	118	86.1%
	Unable to Meet Physical Distance Requirements at Break Rooms	92	67.1%
Policy	Intubate LIS patient in Negative Pressure	6	4.4%
	Intubate HIS patient in Negative Pressure	88	64.2%
	Dedicated Intubation Teams ICU/Anesthesia	57	47.5%
	Intubation HIS/COVID with Video Laryngoscopy	98	71.5%
	Use HFNC for Hypoxic COVID-19 Patients	65	54.2%
	Use NIV for Hypoxic COVID-19 Patients	101	85.6%
	Use NIV with in-line expiration viral filter	19	16.1%
	No PPE Training	4	2.9%
	PPE Group Training in-person with observed practice	66	48.2%
	PPE Individual Training in-person with observed practice	40	29.2%
	Simulation Training of Intubation in COVID-19 Patient	100	75.8%
	Simulation Training of NIV in COVID-19 Patient	68	51.5%
	Simulation Training of Self-Proning in COVID-19 patient	18	13.5%
	Not Monitored During Donning PPE	39	30.2%
	Not Monitored During Doffing PPE	44	34.1%
PPE	Not N95 Fit Tested by time of this survey	15	11.0%
	Fit tested by Qualitative Method (odor or taste)	82	60.2%
	Fit tested by Quantitative Method (machine sampling)	41	30.1%
	Wear N95 for HIS/COVID patient not receiving AGP	61	48.4%
	Wear N95 or PAPR for AGP of HIS/COVID patient	110	87.3%
	N95 Masks Unavailable	6	4.4%
	Re-use N95 Masks Without Sterilization	12	8.8%
	Re-use N95 Masks After Sterilization	3	2.2%
	Elastomeric Respirators Unavailable	63	46.0%
	PAPRs Unavailable	78	56.9%

(which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuit
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Figure 1: Question: Are you able to meet minimum physical distancing requirements in certain non-clinical areas of the ED?



(which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuit
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Figure 2: Question: If there were another wave of COVID-19 in NZ, what are your views regarding your ability to do the following:



(which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuit
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Table 2: Heat map of PPE chosen by ED SMOs for various clinical scenarios. Low (LIS) and High (HIS) Index of Suspicion for COVID-19. Aerosol Generating Procedure (AGP).

PPE	Non-Patient Care	Tea Room	Toilet	LIS	HIS	HIS + AGP
Standard precautions	75%	69%	75%	87%	71%	67%
Face shield	1%	0%	2%	4%	71%	75%
Safety glasses/goggles	1%	0%	1%	12%	79%	76%
Surgical masks	31%	9%	10%	61%	71%	34%
Reusable fabric masks	2%	1%	1%	2%	6%	5%
N-95 masks/respirators	0%	0%	1%	6%	48%	83%
Elastomeric respirators	0%	0%	0%	0%	3%	2%
PAPR	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	2%
Disposable surgical hat	0%	0%	1%	2%	25%	29%
Reusable Surgical hat	0%	0%	1%	4%	7%	7%
Standard disposable isolation gown	0%	0%	1%	13%	87%	84%
Full-body impermeable suit	0%	0%	0%	2%	6%	7%
Gloves	2%	0%	1%	52%	90%	83%
Double gloves	0%	0%	0%	1%	21%	25%
Foot coverings	0%	0%	0%	1%	16%	13%

(which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuit
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Figure 3: Question: During the initial COVID-19 outbreak, consider how you felt about the following:



(which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuit
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Table 3: Rank the most likely reason that you think puts you at risk of exposure to COVID-19 at Work? (1 for most likely, 8 for least likely).

Rank	Risk	Mean	S.D.
1	Wearing inadequate PPE for patient(s) not suspected of COVID-19 infection	2.93	1.87
2	Contracting it from a fellow staff member in the ED	3.06	1.85
3	Accidental PPE doffing exposure	3.53	1.87
4	Wearing inadequate PPE for patient(s) suspected of COVID-19 infection	3.67	1.65
5	Not being able to access adequate PPE	4.44	2.20
6	Inadequate mask fit testing for staff	5.62	1.98
7	Cleaners have been provided inadequate training and/or inadequate PPE	5.66	1.52
8	Not applicable- I do not fear risk of COVID-19 exposure at work	6.57	2.52